EXHIBIT 2

DEPOSITION

TRANSCRIPT OF

ROBERT T. CARTER

1

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN SOUTHERN DIVISION

TEOKA S. WILLIAMS,

Plaintiff,

Case No.

vs.

2:18-cv-12522-VAR-MKM Hon. Victoria A. Roberts

BEAUMONT HEALTH,

Defendant.

DEPOSITION OF ROBERT T. CARTER, Ph.D.

APPEARING VIA TELEPHONE

Taken by the Defendant on Thursday, November 7, 2019, at Butzel Long, 301 East Liberty, Suite 500, Ann Arbor, Michigan, at 3:09 p.m.

APPEARANCES:

For the Plaintiff:

MS. JULIE A. GAFKAY P53680 APPEARING VIA TELEPHONE

GAFKAY LAW, PLC

175 South Main Street

Frankenmuth, Michigan 48734

(989) 652-9240

jgafkay@gafkaylaw.com

For the Defendant:

MS. REGAN K. DAHLE P53975

BUTZEL LONG, a professional corporation

301 East Liberty, Suite 500 Ann Arbor, Michigan 48104

(734) 995-3110 dahle@butzel.com

AND

MS. HANNAH E. TREPPA P80978

BUTZEL LONG, a professional corporation

150 West Jefferson, Suite 100

Detroit, Michigan 48226

(313) 983-6999 treppa@butzel.com

Verbatim Court Reporters, P.C. (810) 772-1156

- 1		
		2
1	ALSO PRESENT VIA TELEPHONE:	Teoka S. Williams
2	DEDODMED DV.	
3	REPORTED BY:	Julie L. DuCoin, CSR-4216, RPR Verbatim Court Reporters, P.C. (810) 772-1156
4		verbatim@charter.net
5		
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
- 1		
25		

7 1 Q. Do you have both your expert report and your CV there with 2 you? 3 A. I do. 4 Q. Okay. Great. 5 Now, as far as your report goes, is there 6 anything that you have not yet reviewed that you're 7 planning on reviewing or that you expect to review in 8 order for you to complete your expert report in this 9 matter? 10 A. Not that I'm aware of. Okay. And, Dr. Carter, if, at any time, I ask you a 11 0. 12 question that you don't understand, because I am not an 13 expert in the area in which you practice, I will likely 14 use words that maybe are the incorrect words or maybe it 15 won't make complete sense to you. If you could just let 16 me know, and I'll do my best to rephrase it so that it's a 17 question that you understand; okay? 18 A. Yes. 19 Q. Can you describe for me, Dr. Carter, the area in 20 which you hold yourself out as an expert? 21 The area, I describe it broadly as race and culture with Α. 22 particular focus on race-based traumatic stress in 23 situations that involve racial discrimination of some type 24 or form. 25 Q. And is that limited to just in the employment

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Robert T. Carter, Ph.D. November 7, 2019

34 Q. Let me just -- but you understand that in the law, there's a legal standard in the law; correct? You understand that that could be different than what the researchers are writing about in terms of the general social psychology impact of racism on somebody; correct? No -- so the law had me a few decades ago as just Α. property, because the law can shift and change based on social perceptions and sentiments and perspectives. how the law is framed today, how it was framed 50 years ago, how it was framed a hundred years ago shifts and changes. So I was not asked to do an analysis of the law. That's not what I was asked to do. Okay. Let's go back. You talked about how a white person Q. and a black person might interpret different events differently because of race. But the question I asked you about Ms. Kopriva and Ms. Williams and Ms. Kalondo was a fact-based question, and the facts that they understand them as to have occurred, they report them differently.

Ms. Kopriva reports the fact that the patient did not reference Ms. Williams' race. Ms. Kalondo and Ms. Williams report the fact that the patient did.

So in writing your opinion, whose version of the facts did you believe?

72 1 discriminatory intent? 2 In my opinion, their failure to act exacerbated the Α. 3 distress that Ms. Williams experienced. 4 Q. Correct. 5 But you don't know whether they acted that way 6 with the intent to discriminate against Williams or they 7 acted that way because they just mishandled the 8 investigation; correct? 9 A. It was harm either way. 10 Q. So it doesn't matter -- in your opinion, it doesn't matter 11 whether Beaumont intended to discriminate against 12 Ms. Williams or not when you're opining as to whether or 13 not she was harmed? 14 Α. I wouldn't say it doesn't matter; I would say that that's 15 not my purview. 16 Q. So I'll go back to my question. Then you do agree 17 with me that it is plausible that Beaumont engaged in all 18 of the actions that it did without the intent to 19 discriminate against Ms. Williams because of her race? 20 A. I disagreed the first time, and I disagree with you now. 21 0. So it's not plausible Beaumont acted with a 22 non-discriminatory intent in your view? I disagreed the first time you asked, and --23 A. 24 Q. That's not my question. 25 Sir, you keep providing me conflicting answers.

81 1 in my report. 2 0. I'm sorry, I think I must have missed -- I didn't 3 understand what you were saying there. 4 So you're confident that Dr. Marsh did not 5 discuss with Ms. Williams the racial component of the 6 discrimination here? 7 Correct. Α. 8 0. Okay. 9 Α. Yes. 10 0. Okay. I asked Dr. Marsh the following question: 11 get any -- this is on Page 48 of your deposition. Did you 12 get any indication from Ms. Williams how she responded to 13 people who had racial animus towards her, I mean how it 14 made her feel? And then he answers -- he provides his 15 answer: Per her presentation, it was distressing, and 16 then he goes in further. 17 So does that change your opinion that he didn't 18 discuss with her the issue of racial discrimination or 19 racial -- or racism? 20 It does not. Α. 21 Q. Okay. Is it your testimony that a white therapist cannot treat an African American patient who's claiming to have 22 23 been the victim of racism? 24 Α. It is not. 25 So I think Ms. Williams testified and Dr. Marsh Q.

82 1 testified that Ms. Williams treated with him as many as 10 2 times. 3 And how long did you meet with Ms. Williams? 4 I met with her over the course of two days. A. 5 Q. How many hours? 6 Α. I am not positive, but I want to say about eight, maybe 7 nine hours. 8 Q. And did you take notes of those sessions? 9 I did. A. 10 Q. Okay. And have you produced those -- given those notes to 11 Ms. Gafkay? 12 I can. I have not. 13 Q. I think those would be certainly subject to 14 discovery as part of your expert report, and we'd like 15 those to be produced, please. 16 A. No problem. 17 Your interview of Ms. Williams wasn't for the purpose of Q. providing her with psychological counseling, though; was 18 19 it? 20 Α. It was not. 21 And you'll agree with me that this eight to nine Q. 22 hours of interview was occurring nearly two years after 23 the incident in question here; correct? 24 Α. Yes. 25 Q. So would you agree with me that Dr. Marsh's

treatment of Ms. Williams as many as 10 times around the time of the incident would be a more reliable -- or that Dr. Marsh would be able to provide a more reliable opinion as to Ms. Williams' emotional distress than you would be able to provide?

A. No.

- Q. And why is that?
- A. I wasn't talking to her about her general psychological distress as he was, nor was I trying to help her build and learn coping strategies as he was.

My focus was on what happened to her and how she was affected by it and also gathering background information. So my purpose was distinctly different from his.

More importantly, my training and background is distinctly different from his. I focus on race and culture both in training and in scholarship and in research. He does not.

I went to a research oriented and clinically oriented program. He was in more of a clinically oriented program than I was. So I would think that while he may have been effective at trying to relieve some of her symptoms, the generic symptoms that she was experiencing, I would not suggest that she was better or more credible in understanding what happened to her, no.